

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/657,875	(	09/09/2003	Chien-Ming Cheng	LELI 3495	2089	
321	7590	06/23/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
SENNIGER ONE METRO		· · ·	IM, JUNC	IM, JUNGHWA M		
16TH FLOOR				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ST LOUIS, 1	ST LOUIS, MO 63102 2811					
				DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/657,875	CHENG ET AL.					
Office Action S	Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Junghwa M. Im	2811					
The MAILING DATE ( Period for Reply	of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ac	idress				
A SHORTENED STATUTO THE MAILING DATE OF TI  - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mai  - If the period for reply specified about - If NO period for reply is specified ab  - Failure to reply within the set or exte Any reply received by the Office late earned patent term adjustment. See	HIS COMMUNICATION. under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 ing date of this communication. It is less than thirty (30) days, a reply ove, the maximum statutory period wonded period for reply will, by statute, or than three months after the mailing	36(a). In no event, however, may within the statutory minimum of t vill apply and will expire SIX (6) M cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timel ONTHS from the mailing date of this c ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. xommunication.				
Status								
1) Responsive to comm	unication(s) filed on 3/20/	<u> 2006</u> .						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL.	2b)☐ This	action is non-final.						
,								
Disposition of Claims								
4)	n(s) is/are withdrawallowed. iected. objected to.							
Application Papers								
9) ☐ The specification is of	•							
	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing s 11) The oath or declaration			ng(s) is objected to. See 37 C ned Office Action or form P					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	1							
2. Certified copies 3. Copies of the capplication from	e) None of: s of the priority documents of the priority documents	s have been received. s have been received in rity documents have bee u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National	l Stage				
Attachment(s)	) e02\	A) [ ] !-4::	u Summany /DTO 412\					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTC</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent</li> </ol>			w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement Paper No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Other:	of Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/657,875

Art Unit: 2811

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites a limitation of "... guide micro-deformation ... resulting in a rough contacting interface between said die 16 and solder platform 17 ..." It is unclear how the micro-deformation can be guided since micro-deformation means a defect in the device. Furthermore, the instant invention does not disclose that a rough surface is not formed by the anchor mechanism.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spitz et al. (US 6060776), hereinafter Spitz in view of Spitz et al. (US 6667545), hereinafter Spitz'545.

Regarding claim 1, insofar as understood, Fig. 1 of Spitz shows a diode (100) comprising a connecting means (8;a wire) and a heat sink base (a region below the wire 8);

Application/Control Number: 10/657,875

Art Unit: 2811

said connecting means comprising a flat end (7) fixed at a die (4) and the other end having no fixed shape;

said heat sink base comprising;

a base (2) which is on the bottom of the heat sink base;

a press-fit region (11) which is around said base (2);

a solder platform (3) which is above said base;

a die (4) which has a first side and a second side electrically coupled to said flat end (7) and said solder platform (3), respectively;

an acclivitous shoulder (15) which is extended from said solder platform, the root of said shoulder connected to said solder platform; and

a cup (9) which is extended upwardly from the periphery of said base (2);

characterized in that said solder platform has an anchor mechanism equipped with the said acclivitous shoulder and a kink, said mechanism can not only absorbed the stress generated by the package (13) but also guide micro-deformation and provide a longer path for moisture to reach the die, thereby avoiding damage of the die and resulting in a rough contacting interface between the die and the solder platform and preventing moisture from reaching the die directly even if moisture enters the gap existing between the shoulder and the passivation film (14).

Fig. 1 of Spitz shows substantially the entire claimed structure except the packaging is epoxy. Fig. 1 of Spitz-645 shows an epoxy packaging (40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Spitz'545 to the device of Spitz in order to have the package formed with epoxy since epoxy is well known and readily available packaging material.

Note that a functional recitation of "the combination of said acclivitous shoulder and the kink can absorbed the stress generated by the package and provide a longer path for moisture to reach the die, thereby preventing moisture from reaching the die directly even if moisture enters the gap existing between the shoulder and the passivation film" would not have carried patentable weight because it is narrative in form. In order to be given patentable weight, a functional recitation must be expressed as a "means" for performing the specified function, as set forth in 35 USC \$112, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, and must be supported by recitation in the claim of sufficient structure to warrant the presence of the functional language. *In re Fuller*, 1929 C.D. 172; 388 O.G. 279.

In addition, Spitz discloses that the combination of the acclivitous shoulder and the kink can absorb the stress generated by the package (col. 2, lines 58-62).

Regarding claim 2, Fig. 6 of Spitz-645 shows said shoulder has a height which is substantially the same as said die.

Also, note that Figures 3-5 of Spitz'535 show of a shoulder with a various height and an angle. Therefore, a variation in the height of the shoulder would have been obvious matter of an optimized design configuration since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Dailey, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

Regarding claim 3, Spitz discloses said connecting means is a lead wire (col. 3, line 22).

Regarding claim 4, Fig. 1 of Spitz shows the diode further comprises two solder layers (5a) and (5b) which sandwich said die (4) above and under, respectively.

Regarding claim 5, Fig. 1 of Spitz shows the diode further comprises passivative material (14) used to surround said wafer (4).

Page 5

Regarding claim 6, Spitz'545 discloses the diode further comprises a resin (44; col. 3, line 11) for surrounding outside said passivative material (38).

Regarding claim 7, Fig. 1 of Spitz shows the diode further comprises a sheath (12) for surrounding the encapsulating material (13) inside said cup.

Regarding claim 8, Fig. 1 of Spitz shows further comprises a sheath (12) for surrounding the encapsulating material (13) outside said cup (9).

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 11, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant mainly argues that the instant invention has advantages that are not taught in the Spitz and the Spitz'545 references. However, it is pointed out that the instant invention is directed to the device claims and the combined teachings of Spitz and Spitz'545 show all the elements of the structure recited in the instant invention, in particular, a kink. Fig. 2 of Spitz shows that the acclivitous shoulder is not protruding from the top surface of the base 3. Rather the shoulder is extended through forming a kink from the top of the base. Furthermore, Spitz'545 also shows a kink formation on the top surface of the base.

In addition, it is confusing that Applicants argue that ".... the present invention would not result in the rough contacting interface ..." However, the instant invention recites "... resulting in a rough contacting interface

### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Junghwa M. Im whose telephone number is (571) 272-1655. The examiner can normally be reached on MON.-FRI. 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie C. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/657,875

Art Unit: 2811

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jmi

**EDDIE LEE** 

Page 7

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800